

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/758,241		TANAKA, KATSUHISA	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jerry A. Lorengo		1734	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorengo.

(3) _____.

(2) Ms. Laleh Jalali.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 September 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 2,559,649.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

J.A. LORENZO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Jalali and the examiner discussed claims 1 and 7 and specifically the manner in which the catalyst carrier film is pre-cooled prior to transfer lamination with the polymer electrolyte film. The Little et al. reference was also discussed and the manner taught by them of impinging heated or cooled air upon the transfer film prior to transfer lamination. The examiner and Ms. Jalali discussed amending the applicant claims to disclose that the transfer film is cooled from the carrier side as compared to the Little et al. reference which impinges air from the transferable coating side. Ms. Jalali indicated that the suggestions for claim amendment would be discussed with the applicant and that a response to the last office action would be forthcoming.